

Top 10 State Issues for Proposed Plan

Version 2/8/16

Number	Topic	Description	Schedule
1	Operable Units	Designate OUs to increase implementability – specify OUs in Proposed Plan.	Resolve by 3/1 (50% complete)
2a	Schedule	Need detailed schedule identifying key milestones for issuance of a Dec 2016 ROD and check-in points with the State. Include schedule and process for State making concurrence determination.	100% complete
2b	Outreach	Need written plan for early and extensive outreach between now and end public comment period on the Proposed Plan.	100% complete (thru pre-PP)
3	Cost	Revise cost estimate in consideration of DEQ's prior recommendations for cost reduction and comment #10 below regarding Arkema NAPL interpretation.	Resolve by 2/19 (80% complete, consensus likely, DEQ's independent cost estimate not on critical path)
4	SC Compliance & Recontamination	Need to agree on compliance criteria and points of compliance for GW and StW pathways. Also need definition of sediment recontamination that addresses both upland and in-water sources. Include in Proposed Plan.	Resolve by 3/1 (80% complete, consensus unlikely)
5	Riverbanks & RAO9	Clarify whether "riverbank" includes beach areas. Also clarify utilization of RAO 9 PRGs in remedy selection and integration with source control efforts.	Resolve by 3/1 (90% complete, consensus likely)
6	Institutional Controls	Minimize restrictions on river-related use of Harbor. E.g., RNAs should not restrict all navigation and river-related activities as was done with M&B and GASCO.	Resolve by 3/1 (30% complete, consensus uncertain)
7	Fish Advisories	Need plan describing effective use of fish advisories (see DEQ pages 16-18 comment on draft FS). Include concepts in Proposed Plan – flush out remaining details in ROD.	Resolve by 3/1 (20% complete, consensus uncertain)
8	Disposal Options and Impacts to State Transportation System	Identify disposal options (e.g., upland sites) that incentivize use of barge and rail for bulk material transport. Include concepts in Proposed Plan. Flush out remaining details in ROD.	Resolve by 3/1 (0% complete)
9	Surface vs Subsurface	specify how SMAs will be delineated and under what conditions active remediation will be required in areas where surfaced sediment is below	Resolve by 3/1 (0% complete)

Top 10 State Issues for Proposed Plan

Version 2/8/16

	Contamination in Delineating SMAs	RALs but subsurface sediment exceeds RALs – will decision tree be different for RD than in the FS for developing the preferred alternative – include decision tree in Proposed Plan.	
10	NAPL and Hazardous Waste Interpretation at Arkema	Based on DEQ's review of the EPA FS and statements made to the NRRB, DEQ understands that EPA is assuming thermal treatment of dredged sediment adjacent to the Arkema site in its remedy cost estimates. The multiple phases of sediment investigation have not encountered sediment exhibiting NAPL saturated conditions that would warrant thermal treatment prior to management. The most significant observations have been the occasional sheen and product bleb. While it is possible that RD data or RA could encounter a pocket of heavily NAPL impacted sediment, DEQ suggests that EPA adaptively manage these potential circumstances rather than ascribe a large treatment cost associated with these sediments to the Portland Harbor remedy. Additionally, EPA correctly notes in the FS that the sediment adjacent to the Arkema site containing DDX contains a state listed hazardous waste (pesticide residue). DEQ wants to be clear that land disposal of these sediments does not require treatment under Oregon Administrative Rules.	Resolve by 3/1 (90% complete)